BONELLI, F.-A., , 1810. *Observations Entomologiques.* Première Partie. [Turin.] 58 pages, 1 table.

_____1812. Observations Entomologiques. Première Partie. *Mém. Acad. Imp. Sci., Litt. et Beaux-arts Turin. (Mémoires Présentés . . .)* vol. 18: 21-78.

_____1813a. *Observations Entomologiques.* Deuxième Partie. Turin. 52 pages.

_____ 1813b. Observations Entomologiques. Deuxième Partie. *Mém. Acad. Imp. Sci. Litt. et Beaux-arts Turin,* vol. 20: 433-484.

CROTCH, G.R., 1870. The genera of Coleoptera studied chronologically (1802-21). *Trans. Ent. Soc. London,* 1870: 213-241.

GASKIN, L.J.P. & LEWIS, E., 1956. On the "Tabula Synoptica" and the "Observations Entomologiques" of F.A. Bonelli. *Soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* vol. 3: 158-164, 1 facsimile.

GENÉ, G., 1834. Elogio storico di Franco Andrea Bonelli accademico e professore torinese. *Mem. r. Accad. Sci. Torino,* vol. 37: 126-151.

GERMAR, E.F., 1817. *A review of* Franc-André Bonelli, Observations Entomologiques. Approuvés par l'Academie Impériale des sciences, litterature et beaux arts de Turin le 29 Avril 1809. 4to. maj. Sect. I. pagg. 58. *Mag. Ent.* vol. 2: 301-304.

HORN, W. & SCHENKLING, S., 1928. *Index Litteraturae Entomologicae.* Berlin-Dahlem. vol. 1: 1-352.

LATREILLE, P.A., 1809. *Genera Crustaceorum et Insectorum.* Paris, vol. 4: 1-399.

_____ 1810. *Considérations Générales sur l'Ordre Naturel des Animaux.* Paris. 444 pages.

MROCZKOWSKI, M., 1977. Bonelli, F.A., "Tabula Synoptica, 1811": proposed addition to the official list. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 61-62.

OLIVIER, G.A., 1811. *Articles* Mouche Abeilliforme *to* Nomade *in* Encyclopédie Méthodique. Histoire Naturelle. Insectes, vol. 8(1): 45-360.

STURM, J., 1815. *Deutschlands Fauna.* V. Abtheilung. Die Insecten. Nürnberg. vol. 3: 1-192.

ACYONIDAE AMEGHINO, 1889 (MAMMALIA): SUPPLEMENT TO PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS THIS NAME. Z.N.(S.) 2159

By Larry G. Marshall *(Department of Geology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago),* William A. Clemens *(Department of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley),* Robert J. Hoffstetter *(Institut de Paléontologie, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France),* Rosendo Pascual *(Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo de La Plata, La Plata, Argentina),* Bryan Patterson *(Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge),* Richard H. Tedford *(Department of Vertebrate Paleontology, American Museum of Natural History, New York),* and William D. Turnbull *(Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago).*

In March, 1977 *(Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 33: 212-213), Marshall, Clemens, Hoffstetter, Pascual, Patterson, Tedford and Turnbull proposed that the

Commission should use its plenary powers to suppress the family name ACYONIDAE Ameghino, 1891, in favour of BORHYAENIDAE Ameghino, 1894. We are grateful to Dr. L.B. Holthuis for pointing out a defect in that proposal: so long as *Acyon* Ameghino, 1887, remains an available name, it is impossible to prevent a zoologist from making it the type-genus of a family, so that it is necessary to ask also for the suppression of that generic name. Investigation of that point has revealed another obstacle to our original proposal.

2. In 1887 Ameghino published his *Enumeración sistemática de las especies de mamíferos fósiles coleccionados por C. Ameghino en los terrenos Eocenos de la Patagonia austral y depositados en el Museo La Plata,* 26 + (2) pp. This publication, together with two others by Ameghino in the same year, was evidently subsidized by the Museo de La Plata. All three are listed as "*Publicaciones esporadicas del Museo de La Plata"* on page 18 of R. Lehmann-Nitzche's "*Museo de La Plata. Indice bibliográfico de sus publicaciones* issued by the La Plata Museum in 1928. On: 8 Ameghino proposed *Boryhaena* [*sic*] *tuberata* gen. y sp. nov. and *Acyon tricuspidatus* gen. y sp. nov. and accompanied each with a description. In the copy in the British Museum (Natural History), the spelling *Boryhaena* has been corrected by hand to *Borhyaena* in ink now faded to brown. It can only be conjectured that this correction was made by the author, but the fact remains that the correct original spelling of the name is *Boryhaena.* It is, however, clear that the author intended *Borhyaena,* for he used the revised spelling in his much more important monograph in 1889, *Actas Acad. Nat. Sci. Córdoba,* vol. 6: 285, 288, 924, 927, 963 (where *B. tuberata* is still the only included species) and in his later works, and it is the spelling that has been consistently used by later authors. *Borhyaena* Ameghino, 1889 is clearly an unjustified emendation of *Boryhaena* and we seek the use of the plenary powers to rule that it is a justified emendation, with the author and date of *Boryhaena.*

3. We have considered whether we should alter our original proposal so as to give BORHYAENIDAE precedence over ACYONIDAE when both names are applied to the same taxon, and have decided not to do so. This is because ACYONIDAE has not been used as a valid name since 1904, while *Acyon* itself has been treated as invalid for over fifty years (as pointed out in our original publication). To give protection to names unused for so long seems unnecessary.

4. We wish to replace our original proposal to the Commission by requesting that it:

(1) use its plenary powers
  (a) to rule that the spelling *Borhyaena* first used by Ameghino, 1889, is a justified emendation of *Boryhaena* Ameghino, 1887;
  (b) to suppress the generic name *Acyon* Ameghino, 1887, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(2) place the generic name *Borhyaena* Ameghino, 1887 (gender, feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Borhyaena tuberata* Ameghino, 1887, as validated under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name *tuberata* Ameghino, 1887, as published in the binomen *Boryhaena* [*sic*] *tuberata* (specific name of type-species of *Borhyaena* Ameghino, 1887) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(4) place the generic name *Acyon* Ameghino, 1887, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
(5) place the family name ACYONIDAE Ameghino, 1889 (unavailable because the name of its type-genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE FOR THE TYPE-SPECIES OF *STROMATOPORELLA* NICHOLSON, 1886. Z.N.(S.) 2177

(see vol. 33: 233-240)

By M.J. Benton *(Department of Zoology, University of Aberdeen, U.K.)*

St Jean (1977) could not find the original figured specimen of *Stromatoporella granulata* (Nicholson, 1873) (type-locality: Port Colborne, Ontario) in the British Museum (Natural History) or any other repository of the Nicholson collection. This original figured specimen was only a hand specimen and no sections were figured when the species was first described. St Jean identified the specimen and sections (BMNH P6021, nos. 329, 329a-f) used by Nicholson in his later descriptions (1878, 1886, etc.). These came from Arkona, Ontario, and are of slightly later age than the original figured specimen. These apparently display the characters of *S. granulata* and the genus *Stromatoporella* well, and he asks that they be designated the neotype.

During 1976 and 1977 I worked on a catalogue of Nicholson's type and figured specimens, visiting about 10 institutions in which his collections are now preserved. In none of these did I find the original specimen figured by Nicholson in 1874. BMNH H4524 comes from Port Colborne (the original locality) but is probably not the figured specimen. For the following reasons, I think St Jean is justified in requesting that BMNH P6021, nos. 329, 329a-f, be designated as neotype:

(1) this specimen and its slides form a series which was used by Nicholson in his first description of internal structures of the species and, in 1886, of the genus *Stromatoporella;*
(2) there is no evidence that Nicholson sectioned the original figured specimen, and sections are essential in defining stromatoporoid taxa. If the original were found, and sections made from it, the latter might not correspond with the interpretation of *S. granulata* based on sections of specimens from a different horizon (Nicholson, 1878, 1886, and subsequent authors);
(3) the proposed neotype is in the British Museum (Natural History) and Nicholson's other stromatoporoid types are preserved there;
(4) according to St Jean, the proposed neotype well displays the characters of its species and of the genus of which it is the type-species.